Communicating the health risks of wildfire smoke exposure: Health literacy considerations of public health campaigns

Lily A. Cook, MA[1]
[1]Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon

Abstract
Effective communication about the health effects of wildfire smoke is important to protect the public, especially the consumers most vulnerable to the effects of wildfire smoke exposure: those with chronic respiratory conditions, children, and older adults. The objective of this paper is to examine the clarity and accessibility of visual materials intended to educate consumers about the health effects of wildfire. The CDC Clear Communications Index (CCI) is used to evaluate whether materials adhere to the main principles of health literacy: clarity and accessibility. In addition, gaps in the materials are identified and the accuracy of the information presented is assessed in light of current medical literature. Our finding is that most materials focus on communicating specific behavioral recommendations for protecting the health of the consumers, particularly to avoid exposure to air polluted by wildfire smoke by staying indoors, reducing activity levels, and using air purifiers or approved dust masks.

Introduction
Due to climate change, the intensity and frequency of wildfires has been increasing in the western United States,(1) causing growing numbers of consumers to be exposed to wildfire smoke and its subsequent health impacts. As a result, there is an emergent need to educate the public about the issue and to provide materials that can be easily understood by the layperson. Educating the public is necessary so consumers can take steps to protect themselves from the health effects of wildfire smoke, the most well-documented of which is the exacerbation of pre-existing respiratory disease. Because wildfire smoke exposure is episodic and only lasts between a couple of hours and several days, it is possible to prevent the worst effects by taking safeguards such as staying indoors. However, these educational attempts only succeed if the precaution is communicated in a way that is engaging and accessible to consumers.(2) The clarity of the messaging presented to consumers about wildfire smoke, therefore, is an important public health issue.

Methods and Materials
Data sources and searches: Internet search was conducted during February and March of 2019 to gather a comprehensive sample of materials, most of which were collected using snowball sampling of resource lists provided by state and local government. A list of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the materials is listed in Table 1. All materials were scored by a single rater in order to assure consistency.

	✓ **Included:**	X **Excluded:**
Topic/Focus	Materials primarily focused on the physical health effects of wildfire exposure.	Materials detailing the health effects of smoke from non-wildfire sources (such as house fire), pollutants from other sources (such as vehicle emissions), or the psychological aftereffects of wildfire.
Availability	Materials publicly available during search period (Feb/March 2019).	Not available to public during search period (Feb/March 2019).
Intended audience	Materials intended for consumers.	Materials intended for specific professions; occupational safety materials.
Type of material	Fact sheets, pamphlets, health cards, handouts and flyers (i.e., 1 - 2 pages of educational material that could be distributed by a health provider or public health official). Infographics, if they can be used on their own as standalone materials.	Temporary alerts or press releases; infographics that could not be used on their own (i.e., intended for use as illustrations for more comprehensive materials).
Language	Materials available in English.	Materials available only in languages other than English.

Intended distribution area	Materials intended for use by US consumers.	Materials intended for consumers outside the US (such as Canada or Australia).

Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Evaluation Framework

In order to rate the accessibility of the materials, the Clear Communication Index (CCI) was used. The CCI was created in 2013 by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) in order to assess whether materials can be easily understood by the consumers.(3) The Index emphasizes the importance of clarity when communicating health information, and was developed based on known best practices for consumer-facing materials, particularly the Suitability Assessment of Materials created by health literacy pioneers Cecilia and Leonard Doak.(2) The Clear Communication Index begins with four open-ended questions about the intended audience and message. Next, the Index asks yes or no questions which can be scored to create a rating of the overall accessibility of the material. Specific examples of criteria are provided on the score sheet in order to reduce ambiguity, and the score sheet also refers the evaluator back to the user guide for more comprehensive explanations if necessary. Table 2 includes a complete list of questions in the Index and their scoring criteria. The Clear Communication Index's User Guide suggests four possible uses for the Index, including "to quickly assess the clarity and ease of use of an already released communication product."(4) Several studies have used the Clear Communication Index to evaluate the ability of consumer materials to clearly communicate health information, such as a recent analysis of patient guidelines for common cancers(5), and another of patient materials for sickle cell disease.(6)

The Index recommends a score at least 90% in order for any given material to be considered accessible to consumers at all levels of health literacy. Although there are 20 questions in the full Clear Communication Index, it should be noted that the Index flexibly provides the ability to skip some areas if they do not apply to the material being evaluated. This means that the overall number of points available can vary, because areas that do not apply are excluded from the denominator.

Evaluation area:	**Questions:**	**Scoring:**
Open-ended clarifications	1. Who is your primary audience? 2. What do you know about the health literacy skills of your audience? 3. What is your primary communication objective? 4. What is the main message statement in the material?	Not scored.
Main Message and Call to Action (Core criteria)	1. Does the material contain one main message statement? 2. Is the main message at the top, beginning, or front of the material? 3. Is the main message emphasized with visual cues? 4. Does the material contain at least one visual that conveys or supports the main message? 5. Does the material include one or more calls to action for the primary audience?	Each Yes = 1 point; if NO main message statement, questions 1-5 all score 0.
Language (Core criteria)	1. Do both the main message and the call to action use the active voice? 2. Does the material always use words the primary audience uses?	Each Yes = 1 point; No = 0
Information Design (Core criteria)	1. Does the material use bulleted or numbered lists? 2. Is the material organized in chunks with headings? 3. Is the most important information the primary audience needs summarized in the first paragraph or section?	Each Yes = 1 point; No = 0
State of the Science (Core criteria)	1. Does the material explain what authoritative sources, such as subject matter experts and agency spokespersons, know and don't know about the topic?	Yes = 1 point; No = 0
Behavioral Recommendations	1. Does the material include one or more behavioral recommendations for the primary audience? 2. Does the material explain why the behavioral recommendation(s) is important? 3. Does the behavioral recommendation(s) include specific directions about how to perform the behavior?	*Optional. If relevant, Yes = 1 point; No = 0.

Numbers	1. Does the material always present numbers the primary audience uses? 2. Does the material always explain what the numbers mean? 3. Does the audience have to conduct mathematical calculations?	*Optional. If relevant, Yes = 1 point; No = 0
Risk	1. Does the material explain the nature of the risk? 2. Does the material address both the risks and benefits of the recommended behaviors? 3. If the material uses numeric probability to describe risk, is the probability also explained with words or a visual?	*Optional. If relevant, Yes = 1 point; No = 0

** These sections may be skipped; if omitted, they are not included in denominator of the final score. As a result, the denominator for the final score may vary between 11 and 20.*

Table 2: Evaluation areas and questions included in the Clear Communication Index.[4]

Results

I located a total of 50 materials for evaluation. The average Clear Communication Index score was 83.2% (SD 11.9%), which is below the 90% recommended by the CDC. The most prolific producer of these materials is the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), who created eight distinct publications. The EPA also collaborated with the US Forest Services, the US CDC, and the California Air Resources board to produce "Wildfire Smoke: A Guide for Public Health Officials,"(7) which served as the basis for many of the materials. Several states have produced materials, including the Western states of California, Washington, Oregon, Montana, and New Mexico. At the most local level, numerous air districts within California have also produced public health campaigns on wildfire smoke and human health. Seven of the materials (14%) were made available in languages other than English.

Most materials were focused on providing specific behavioral recommendations to consumers, such as "stay indoors during periods of heavy smoke." As a result, nearly all materials scored well on the Behavioral Recommendations portion of the Clear Communication Index. The most frequently recommended behavior was to avoid exposure to smoky air by staying indoors, reducing activity levels, and using air purifiers or approved dust masks.

Of the core questions, the most often missed was the requirement that the material "contain at least one visual that conveys or supports the main message."(4) While most materials did include at least one graphic illustration, they nevertheless missed the criteria because either (a) the graphic did not have a caption or label, or (b) because the people depicted were not performing the behavior recommended in the material.(8) Very few materials presented numerical information to consumers, and as a result this section of the Clear Communication Index (see Table 2, 'Numbers') was the most likely to be omitted from the scoring.

The risks of wildfire smoke exposure were only occasionally addressed by the materials. It is possible that the creators felt that the risks of breathing wildfire smoke are obvious; historians have noted that the health risks of air pollution seem to be intuitively understood, as evidenced by the fact that people have demonstrated concern about the health effects of air pollution as far back as the 14th century.(9)

Many materials also did a poor job of discussing the risks that may accompany the behaviors they recommended. For example, only some pointed out that staying indoors with the windows closed, a commonly recommended way to avoid smoke, may not be a good idea in hot weather. The failure to provide pros and cons for the recommendations may have been a factor contributing to seemingly contradictory messaging about masks provided during 2018's Camp Fire in California. The city of Sacramento handed out N95 masks at the same time that Sacramento County warned that the masks can "lead to breathing difficulties and elevated heart rate, especially for people with respiratory or cardiac conditions."(10) This warning created the impression that people with respiratory and cardiac conditions should not use the masks, although they are actually the group most in need of them. A more balanced message – perhaps that masks should be used only when outdoors, and should be removed if the user starts feeling light-headed - may have been less confusing to consumers.

Vulnerable populations: Children and the elderly are considered to be more susceptible to the effects of wildfire smoke, and there were several materials devoted to the needs of these more vulnerable populations. For example, the Sacramento Air Quality District of California produced a series of three materials, each designed for a different population: general, children, and older adults. However, the content in this series is remarkably similar, and varies only in the age of the people shown in the illustrations. Interestingly, the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association

has produced a handout that explains how wildfire smoke can affect an overlooked, but highly vulnerable, group: pets. The main message of that material is that "health advisories for air quality also apply to animals," and it notes that birds are particularly susceptible to the effects of wildfire smoke.(11)

There was overlap in material produced at the state and local level, likely because these local campaigns are funded by the CDC and therefore all draw upon the CDC's messaging recommendations. The overlap indicates some duplication of effort that could be handled more efficiently. It is possible the CDC intended local authorities to individualize the material to the specific needs of their residents, but only a few areas seem to have chosen to do so. There are exceptions, however, allowing for a comparison of the communication strategies for different agencies promoting the same health message. For example, although several states (Montana, Washington, Oregon, and California) presented some version of the messaging about air pollution and outdoor activities, Montana's only received a score of 48%, while Oregon's version scored 88%. This is due to the fact that Montana's version made a critical error – it failed to explicitly state its intended main message.

Discussion

This analysis exposed an important flaw in evaluating material for the appropriateness of the audience: the Clear Communication Index assumes that the material is factually correct. For example, several of the local materials in the analysis recommended "the visibility method," including one handout from the Pima County Department of Environmental Quality in New Mexico entitled 'Is it smoky outside? Use the visibility method to protect your health!' The intention is to teach consumers to assess air quality by judging visibility and haze, but the material neglects to inform consumers that this is not an accurate or reliable method for determining air quality. It recommends that consumers "determine how smoky it is based on how far you can see: face away from the sun and pick landmarks (mountain, building, tree, etc.) at known distances."(12) While this does fulfill the requirement to provide "specific directions about how to perform a behavior"(4) (Clear Communication Index question 14), this recommendation is suspect because even high levels of air pollution sometimes cannot be seen or smelled – a fact which is not mentioned in the material. The visibility method also assumes that consumers have access to a 10-mile view from their homes, which seems unlikely, and requires calculations of distance (calculations are discouraged by the Index). Pima County's material omits important caveats about the behavioral recommendations it endorses; however, the Clear Communication Index does not account for the accuracy of the material it evaluates. Ideally, the CCI's assumptions should be included in its User Guide in order to help users understand that the Index's scope is limited to communication clarity only.

Another problem is that there is a necessary trade-off between length of the material and simplicity of the message. Because disease often has complex pathophysiological mechanisms, some complexity must be omitted in order to create a message simple and brief enough to be easily understood. Those who produce materials for consumers need to balance simplicity with complexity, trying not to sacrifice too much of either in the process of keeping the message accessible. Material creators who successfully addressed this issue handled it in two different ways:

1) With a series of materials. Some campaigns broke complex messages into several component parts, producing a series of materials rather than trying to cover all aspects of an issue in a single handout. These materials could then be gathered in a single place and presented as a toolkit. The most comprehensive of these at the federal level is the EPA series Wildfire Smoke Factsheets, a series of five handouts intended to increase preparedness among consumers living in wildfire-prone areas. Topics include selection and proper use of a face mask, tips for protecting children from the health effects of wildfire smoke, selecting a HEPA filter, etc. At the state level, Washington state's Smoke from Wildfires Toolkit also addresses a variety of topics over several fact sheets, and has made these available to a wider audience by translating them into ten languages other than English; the Toolkit site itself is available in fifteen languages.(13)

2) With the use of graphics. When appropriately used, graphics can present information visually in a way that can summarize even complex recommendations simply.(14)

Gaps: Several materials mentioned that children should not use adult-sized masks during wildfire smoke events, but did not provide any alternatives or specify why. Are child-sized masks available, or even advisable? Is it better for children to use an adult mask than no mask at all, or do masks pose a risk to children in some way? Hopefully future materials will provide clearer advice about the issue.

Materials frequently recommended that consumers talk with their doctor about how they may be affected by wildfire smoke exposure, but this strategy only works if doctors are knowledgeable about the topic. To prepare providers, the CDC has recently released an online course called "Particle pollution and your patients' health."(15) This training provides continuing education credits, and although it is not confined to wildfire-generated pollutants, it does contains material intended to help providers understand that wildfire smoke is a major source of particulate air pollution.

Although consumer materials have traditionally presented information visually, the digital revolution has made it easier to create interactive materials. My research located only one interactive material intended to educate consumers about the health effects of wildfire smoke: an app called Smoke Sense. Created by the EPA, Smoke Sense has several features: it functions as a crowd-sourcing app, provides education about air quality, and also delivers current and forecasted conditions. However, in my experience the educational component of the app is buggy and tends to quit unexpectedly, and because air quality information is readily available elsewhere the app's primary function is to crowdsource smoke observations and smoke-related symptoms for the EPA's researchers. Although it may appeal to citizen scientists, at the present time Smoke Sense is of little use to most consumers. At the time of this writing it only rates as three out of five stars by users on iTunes.(16)

Future research: Little is known about whether these campaigns effectively protect public health. Because the issue has only recently acquired public prominence, these campaigns are relatively new and it may be too early to collect data about their effectiveness because the messages have no yet had enough time to disseminate. I was able to locate one systematic review examining the effectiveness of wildfire communications, but the authors of the review were only able to identify 10 articles to include, and many of which were studies of efforts to communicate messaging about issues other than the health effects of wildfire (e.g., coordinating emergency response or evacuation efforts).(17)

Conclusion

A variety of materials designed to educate consumers about how to protect their health from wildfire smoke are currently available, some catered to the needs of vulnerable populations. While these materials do a good job of providing specific behavioral recommendations, future iterations may benefit from being more specific about risks. Additional research is necessary to determine if these messages are clear and accessible enough to successfully protect consumers from the health effects of wildfire smoke exposure.

References

1. Westerling AL, Hidalgo HG, Cayan DR, Swetnam TW. Warming and earlier spring increase western U.S. forest wildfire activity. Science. 2006;313(5789):940.
2. Doak CC, Doak LG, Root JH. Teaching patients with low literacy skills. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott Co; 1996. 212 p.
3. Baur C, Prue C. The CDC Clear Communication Index is a new evidence-based tool to prepare and review health information. Health Promot Pract. 2014;15(5):629-37.
4. CDC Clear Communication Index: user guide. Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of the Associate Director for Communication; 2013. p. 36.
5. Tran BNN, Ruan QZ, Epstein S, Ricci JA, Rudd RE, Lee BT. Literacy analysis of National Comprehensive Cancer Network patient guidelines for the most common malignancies in the United States. Cancer. 2018;124(4):769-74.
6. McClure E, Ng J, Vitzthum K, Rudd R. A mismatch between patient education materials about sickle cell disease and the literacy level of their intended audience. Prev Chronic Dis. 2016;13:E64.
7. Lipsett M, Materna B, Stone SL, Therriault S, Blaisdell R, Cook J. Wildfire smoke: A guide for public health officials. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 2016.

8. Moms Clean Air Force. Take smoke seriously [handout]. Environmental Defense Fund,2017.
9. Lipfert FW. Air pollution and community health: a critical review and data sourcebook New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold; 1994. 534 p.
10. Hodenfield A. Are N95 smoke masks safe? One California county recommends against use. Sacramento Bee. 2018 Nov 16;Sect. California News.
11. Oregon Veterinary Medical Association. Wildfire smoke & animals [pamphlet]. Oregon Veterinary Medical Association, 2017.
12. Pima County Department of Environmental Quality. Is it smoky outside? Use the visibility method to protect your health! [handout]. State of New Mexico.
13. Washington State Department of Health. Smoke From Wildfires - Toolkit [cited 2019 Mar 15]. Available from: https://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/AirQuality/SmokeFromFires/SmokefromFiresToolkits.
14. Houts PS, Doak CC, Doak LG, Loscalzo MJ. The role of pictures in improving health communication: a review of research on attention, comprehension, recall, and adherence. Patient Educ Couns. 2006;61(2):173-90.
15. Cascio WE, Stone SL, Sacks J, Brown JS, Wildermann E. Particle pollution and your patients' health [Clinician training]: US Environmental Protection Agency; 2017. [Available from: https://www.epa.gov/pmcourse].
16. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Smoke sense [mobile application]. Available from: https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/epa-smoke-sense/id1274616255?mt=8.
17. Fish JA, Peters MDJ, Ramsey I, Sharplin G, Corsini N, Eckert M. Effectiveness of public health messaging and communication channels during smoke events: A rapid systematic review. J Environ Manage. 2017;193:247-56.